DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 209 372 UD 021 723

AUTHOR Bartley, Robert
TITLE Desegregation Evaluation Progress Report: Teachers and Administrators Survey Responses. Report No. 79-18.
INSTITUTION Seattle Public Schools, Wash. Dept. of Planning, Research, and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Nov 79
NOTE 30p.; For related documents, see UD 021 719-720, UD 021 722 and UD 021 746. Some tables may be marginally legible due to small size type.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Board of Education Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Program Effectiveness; *School Desegregation; *Staff Development; Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS *Seattle Public Schools WA

ABSTRACT

This report presents the results of a survey of Seattle, Washington teachers and administrators on desegregation planning and implementation. In the first section an assessment of district sponsored human relations courses and other staff development activities by participating teachers and administrators is provided. The second and third sections summarize teachers' and administrators' perspectives on how successful the school district has been in twenty-two aspects of school district operation during the 1978-1979 school year. These two sections also summarize importance that teachers and administrators felt each of these factors played in the success of the 1979-80 school year. Responses to the survey indicated that teachers felt district performance to be marginally acceptable, while administrators felt more positively about district performance, judging it generally acceptable. (Author/APM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David S. Colwell Jr.
Seattle Public Schools

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

DESEGREGATION EVALUATION PROGRESS REPORT: TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS SURVEY RESPONSES

REPORT NO. 79-18
NOVEMBER 1979

ROBERT BARTLEY

Office of
Instructional Program Evaluation

Department of
Planning, Research & Evaluation

SEATTLE
PUBLIC
SCHOOLS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank Ramona Brooks and Ellen Owen for their assistance in preparing this report.

SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Administrative and Service Center
815 Fourth Avenue North

DESEGREGATION EVALUATION PROGRESS REPORT: TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS SURVEY RESPONSES

REPORT NO. 79-18
NOVEMBER 1979

ROBERT BARTLEY

OFFICE OF PLANNING AND BUDGET
R. W. Wilkinson
Executive Director

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND EVALUATION
Susan Stier, Director

OFFICE OF INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM EVALUATION
David G. Colwell, Jr., Supervisor

Prepared by:

Robert Bartley
Evaluator II

Approved by:

Jim James
Planner/Evaluator

David G. Colwell, Jr.
Supervisor

Susan Stier
Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SUMMARY	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
HUMAN RELATIONS TRAINING AND OTHER STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES	2
TEACHERS' RATINGS	3
TEACHERS' RATINGS BY INSTRUCTIONAL LEVEL	5
TEACHERS' IMPORTANCE RANKINGS	7
ADMINISTRATORS' RATINGS	9
ADMINISTRATORS' IMPORTANCE RANKINGS	10
IMPORTANCE RANKINGS AND DEGREE OF SUCCESS COMPARISON	11
COMPARISON OF CENTRAL ADMINISTRATORS, PRINCIPALS, AND TEACHERS AVERAGE GRADE RATINGS	12
CONCLUSIONS	16
RECOMMENDATIONS	17
APPENDIX A - TEACHERS' SURVEY	19
APPENDIX B - ADMINISTRATORS' SURVEY	23

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

As a part of the District's Desegregation Evaluation Plan, surveys were distributed in May, 1979 to all central office administrators at department head level and above, all District principals and teachers, to assess the ongoing District desegregation efforts and to gather insights and information for planning and implementing desegregation programs in subsequent years.

The major findings and conclusions resulting from the administrators and teachers surveys were:

High school teachers ranked "Ethnic Cultural Heritage Program" as the most important activity for a successful implementation of desegregation programs for the 1979-80 school year. Elementary and Jr/Middle teachers ranked "Building Orientation for Pairs and Triads" as the most important activity. Elementary teachers ranked "Multi-ethnic/Multicultural Awareness and Skill Training" as the least important activity and Jr/Middle and High school teachers ranked "Curriculum Training" as least important.

Using the grading scale of (A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, F=0), responses to the teachers survey indicate that teachers rated the District performance in the areas surveyed as marginally acceptable (grade average 1.85). No areas received an overall average grade of excellent "A" or good "B" from the District teachers. Elementary teachers were more satisfied than high school and Jr/Middle school teachers. Sixty-three (63) percent of the District teachers rated the District overall between poor and failing, twenty (20) percent rated the District acceptable and seventeen (17) percent rated the District between good and excellent.

Responses to the administrators survey indicate that central administrators and principals rated the district performance in the areas surveyed with an overall acceptable grade average of 2.22. Forty-one (41) percent of the district administrators rated the District between good and excellent, thirty-nine (39) percent rated the District acceptable and twenty (20) percent rated the District between poor and failing.

Principals and central administrations rated the District higher overall than teachers. Administrators and teachers ranked "School Environment", "Staff Assignments" and "Quality Educational Programs" as the three most important areas for a successful 1979-80 school year and in the same order.

INTRODUCTION

As a part of the District's Desegregation Evaluation Plan, surveys were distributed in May, 1979 to all central office administrators at department head level and above, all District principals and teachers, to assess the ongoing District desegregation efforts and to gather insights and information for planning and implementing desegregation programs in subsequent years.

The purpose of this report is to document and disseminate a summary of teacher and administrator survey results as specified in the Desegregation Evaluation Plan for "1978-79" (April 1978, SPS Document Number 78-3). This report consists of three sections summarizing surveyed administrators' and teachers' perspectives on desegregation programs.* The first section provides an analysis of "Human Relations Training and Other Staff Development Activities". The second and third sections summarize teachers' and administrators' perspectives on how successful the District has been in twenty-two aspects of school district operation during 1978-79 school year. These two sections also summarize importance rankings of these aspects by teachers and administrators for a successful 1979-80 school year under The Seattle Plan.

*Surveys were distributed on May 16, 1979 to all central office administrators at department head level and above, and all District principals. Surveys were returned by approximately one-third of central administrators and two-thirds of principals. Survey returns approximated the sex and ethnic distribution of the District. Another survey was distributed on May 24, 1979 to all District's teachers. Surveys were returned by approximately 25% of these teachers. Teachers' survey returns approximated the sex and ethnic distribution of the District. Copies of the Teacher and Administrator surveys are attached in the appendix.

The reader interested in examining response tallies for individual survey areas may contact the Evaluation Office at 587-5160 Robert Bartley or Jim James.

HUMAN RELATIONS TRAINING AND OTHER STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

District Administrators and teachers who had taken the District's Human Relations Training course were asked to indicate how helpful it had been to them in their work. Of the 94 administrators and 705 teachers who reported having taken the Human Relations course:

39% of administrators and 22% of teachers indicated it had been "very helpful"
50% of administrators and 55% of teachers indicated it had been "helpful"
11% of adminisrators and 23% of teachers indicated it had been "not helpful"

Minority teachers reported Human Relations Training to be more helpful than majority teachers; females reported it to be more helpful than males; and principals reported it to be more helpful than central administrators. All minority administrators and 86% of majority administrators indicated that Human Relations training was "helpful" or "very helpful".

Human Relations Training courses were perceived as least helpful by majority male teachers and central administrators and most helpful by minority male principals.

Teachers who had participated in Staff Development Activities during the past year (Summer Inservice Training, Building Orientation, Central District and In-Building Staff Development Courses/Workshops) were asked to indicate how helpful each activity had been:

SUMMER INSERVICE (64 responses)

48.4% indicated it had been "very helpful".
46.9% indicated it had been "helpful".
4.7% indicated it had been "not helpful".

BUILDING ORIENTATION (216 responses)

36.3% indicated it had been "very helpful".
50.4% indicated it had been "helpful".
13.3% indicated it had been "not helpful".

CENTRAL DISTRICT STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES (179 responses)

45.7% indicated it had been "very helpful".
47.8% indicated it had been "helpful".
6.5% indicated it had been "not helpful".

IN BUILDING STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES (431 responses)

32.5% indicated it had been "very helpful".
48.5% indicated it had been "helpful".
19.0% indicated it had been "not helpful".

Minority female teachers reported Staff Development Activities as most helpful and minority male teachers reported it as least helpful. Overall 89% of the teachers that participated in Staff Development Activities found it to be "helpful" or "very helpful".

Surveyed teachers were also asked to rank the following Staff Development Activities in order of their importance for successful implementation of 1979-80 desegregation programs: (assign a "1" to the most important, "2" to the second most important and so on to the fifth most important.)

1. Human Relations Training
2. Ethnic Cultural Heritage Program (Rainbow)
3. Curriculum Training
4. Multiethnic/Multicultural Awareness and Skills Training
5. Building Orientation for Pairs and Triads

Building Orientation for Pairs and Triads were ranked as most important, followed closely by Ethnic Cultural Heritage Program (Rainbow) and Human Relations Training. Curriculum Training and Multiethnic/Multicultural Awareness and Skill Training were rated least important.

TABLE 1

IMPORTANCE RANKINGS BY INSTRUCTIONAL LEVELS

Staff Development Activities	Instructional Levels		
	Elementary School	Jr/Middle School	High School
Building Orientation for Pairs and Triads	1	1	2
Ethnic Cultural Heritage Program (Rainbow)	4	2	1
Human Relations Training	2	3	3
Curriculum Training	3	5	5
Multiethnic/Multicultural Awareness and Skill Training	5	4	4

High school teachers ranked "Ethnic Cultural Heritage Program" as the most important activity for a successful implementation of desegregation programs for the 1979-80 school year. Elementary and Jr/Middle teachers ranked "Building Orientation for Pairs and Triads" as the most important activity. Elementary teachers ranked "Multiethnic/Multicultural Awareness and Skill Training" as the least important activity and Jr/Middle and High school teachers ranked "Curriculum Training" as least important.

Teachers' Ratings

Teachers were asked to rate the District on the degree of success in a number of areas by giving a grade for each of the areas listed in Table II (next page). On a five point scale (A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, F=0), the average grade for all twenty-two areas was 1.85 (a low C under most grading systems). The average grade given by teachers for each of the twenty-two areas was:

TABLE II

TEACHERS' RATINGS OF TWENTY-TWO AREAS IN THE DISTRICT BY GRADE RANKING

District's Areas	Average Grade*
1. Transportation Services	2.34
2. Quality Educational Programs	2.31
3. School Environment	2.29
4. Central District Staff Development Courses/Workshops	2.15
5. In-Building Staff Development Courses/Workshops	2.14
6. Clear Expectations for Students	2.06
7. Staff Support for District Programs and Activities	2.01
8. Coordination of Activities	2.02
9. Clear Expectations for Staff	1.98
10. Instruction and Curriculum Development	1.98
11. Availability of Information for the Public	1.87
12. Availability of Information for District Personnel	1.83
13. Community Involvement/Parents Interest and Participation	1.81
14. Program Continuity	1.73
15. Planning and Implementation Processes	1.67
16. Staff Assignments	1.65
17. Communication Channels	1.60
18. Resources (funds, materials, staff) Allocation	1.56
19. Decision-Making Process	1.52
20. Long Range Planning	1.47
21. Well-defined Central Administrative Roles and Responsibilities	1.43
22. Central Administrative Support	1.27

*Include Alternative Program Teachers' Rating.

Teachers rated the twenty-two areas between "C+" and "D". The three top areas were "Transportation Services", "Quality Educational Programs", and "School Environment" which received grades of "C+'s". Areas 12 through 22 in Table II received grades below the average, six of these areas received grades of "C-'s", four areas received "D+'s" and one area received a grade of "D". It might be noted that all of these areas graded below average are Central Administrative Functions except area 13 and 14, "Community Involvement/Parents Interest and Participation" and "Program Continuity".

TEACHERS' RATINGS BY INSTRUCTIONAL LEVEL

Table III gives the grade averages for each area and overall grade averages by instructional levels. The overall average for the District was 2.07.* Elementary teachers' rating (2.12) was above the average; high school teachers' average was 2.04 and Jr High/Middle School teachers' average was 1.99-both below the overall average. The major differences among teachers ratings by instructional level, taking into account the size of the differences among the group averages occur in the following areas:

School Environment

Clear Expectations for Students

Staff Support for District Programs and Activities

Clear Expectations for Staff

Communication Channels

Long Range Planning

There was a grade level difference in each of these areas of .17 or greater between the highest and the lowest average. (See Table III next page) The top three areas were the same for each group but in different order. Elementary teachers rated "Quality Educational Programs" first, "School Environment" second, and "Transportation Services" third. Jr High/Middle school teachers rated "Transportation Services", first, "School Environment" second, and "Quality Educational Program" third. High school teachers rated "School Environment" and "Quality Educational Program" a tie for first, and then "Transportation Services".

*Does not include Alternative Program Teachers

TABLE III - TEACHERS' RATINGS BY INSTRUCTIONAL LEVELS[1]

District Areas	Overall Average Grade	Elementary School Average Grade	Jr/Middle School Average Grade	High School Average Grade
Transportation Services	2.46	2.48	2.48	2.39
Quality Educational Programs	2.44	2.51	2.27	2.42
School Environment	2.44	2.50	2.33	2.42
Central District Staff Development Courses/Workshops	2.29	2.37	2.22	2.17
In-Building Staff Development Courses/Workshops	2.28	2.36	2.22	2.15
Clear Expectations for Students	2.21	2.32	2.01	2.13
Staff Support for District Programs and Activities	2.18	2.29	2.06	2.02
Instruction and Curriculum Development	2.17	2.21	2.10	2.13
Coordination of Activities	2.15	2.17	2.01	2.21
Clear Expectations for Staff	2.15	2.22	1.99	2.12
Availability of Information for the Public	2.07	2.12	2.04	1.97
Community Involvement/Parents Interest and Participation	2.05	2.12	1.98	1.93
Programs Continuity	2.02	2.07	1.94	1.96
Availability of Information for District Personnel	2.01	1.99	2.01	2.06
Staff Assignments	2.01	2.01	1.99	2.03
Planning and Implementation Processes	1.88	1.92	1.80	1.86
Resource (funds, materials, staff) Allocation	1.88	1.93	1.82	1.78
Communication Channels	1.87	1.82	1.80	2.04
Long Range Planning	1.81	1.87	1.63	1.83
Decision-Making Process	1.78	1.78	1.71	1.84
Well-defined Central Administrative Roles and Response	1.72	1.74	1.65	1.73
Central Administrative Support	1.70	1.73	1.63	1.67
All Areas	2.07	2.12	1.99	2.04

[1]Does not include Alternative Programs teachers

TEACHERS' IMPORTANCE RANKINGS

Teachers were also asked to rank the five most important areas of the twenty-two listed for a successful 1979-80 school year.

Table IV shows the percentage of times an area was ranked as one of the five most important.

TABLE IV

TEACHERS' PERCENTAGE OF TIME AN AREA WAS RANKED AS ONE OF THE FIVE MOST IMPORTANT

District Areas	Percentage
School Environment	62
Staff Assignments	54
Quality Educational Programs	46
Clear Expectations for Students	37
Clear Expectations for Staff	36
Resource (funds, materials, staff) Allocation	31
Program Continuity	27
Instruction and Curriculum Development	25
Central Administrative Support	19
Communication Channels	17
Community Involvement/Parents Interest and Participation	16
Long Range Planning	14
Staff Support for District Programs and Activities	12
In-Building Staff Development Courses/Workshops	10
Decision-Making Process	10
Planning and Implementation Processes	10
Availability of Information for District Personnel	08
Coordination of Activities	08
Well-defined Central Administrative Roles and Responsibilities	07
Availability of Information for the Public	06
Transportation Services	06
Central District Staff Development Courses/Workshops	04

"School Environment" was ranked as the most important by approximately two-thirds of the teachers (63%), followed in order by "Staff Assignments" (54%), "Quality Educational Programs" (46%), "Clear Expectations for Students" (37%), and "Resource (funds, materials, staff) Allocation" (31%). "Central District Staff Development Courses/Workshops" (4%) was ranked as the least most important, preceded in order by "Availability of Information for the Public" (6%), "Transportation Services" (6%) and "Well-defined Central Administrative Roles and Responsibilities" (7%). It might be noted that all of these areas ranked as the least important are Central Administrative Functions.

Importance Rankings by Instructional Levels

Table V shows the five areas ranked as the most important for a successful school year by instructional level of teachers.

TABLE V

TEACHERS' IMPORTANCE RANKINGS BY INSTRUCTIONAL LEVELS

District Areas	Elementary School Percentage	Jr/Middle School Percentage	High School Percentage
School Environment	60	63	66
Staff Assignments.	54	54	57
Quality Educational Programs	46	45	51
Clear Expectations for Students.	35	44	37
Clear Expectations for Staff	34	42	36

Each instructional level ranked the same five areas as the five most important, the differences in the percentages of each instructional level rankings of these areas are not nearly as significant as the uniform endorsement of the five areas in the same order of importance.

Degree of Success and Importance Rankings Comparison

Two of the five areas ranked most important by teachers "School Environment" and "Quality Educational Programs", were also rated among the five most successful areas. "Staff Assignments" which was rated sixteenth overall in the degree of success was ranked second most important in the rankings. The remaining two areas which were ranked among the five most important, "Clear Expectations for Students", and "Clear Expectations for Staff" were rated sixth and ninth overall in the degree of success. "Transportation Services" which was rated the most successful overall was tied for seventeenth place in most important ranking with "Availability of Information for the Public."

ADMINISTRATORS' RATINGS

Administrators were asked to rate the District on the degree of success by giving a grade for each of the following areas listed in the table below. On a five point scale (A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, F=0), the average grade for all twenty-one areas was 2.22 (a C+ under most grading system). The average grade given by administrators for each of the twenty-one areas was:

TABLE VI

ADMINISTRATORS RATING OF TWENTY-ONE AREAS IN DISTRICT BY AVERAGE GRADE

District Areas	Average Grade
Transportation Services	2.70
School Environment	2.66
Quality Educational Programs	2.50
Central Administrative Support	2.49
Availability of Information for the Public	2.43
Availability of Information for District Personnel	2.32
Planning and Implementation Processes	2.31
Staff Development/Training	2.30
Community Involvement/Parents Interest and Participation	2.29
Clear Expectations for Staff	2.27
Communication Channels	2.27
Staff Support for District Programs and Activities	2.25
Clear Expectations for Students	2.23
Coordination of Activities	2.22
Resource (funds, materials, staff) Allocation	2.09
Instruction and Curriculum Development	2.03
Program Continuity	1.99
Decision-making Process	1.90
Well-defined Central Administrative Roles and Responsibilities	1.89
Long Range Planning	1.81
Staff Assignments	1.74

Administrators rated the twenty-one areas between "B-" and "C-". The top two areas were "Transportation Services", and "School Environment"; which received grades of "B-". The lowest rated areas were "Central Administrative Roles and Responsibilities", "Long Range Planning", and "Staff Assignments", which received grades of "C-". All of these areas are Central Administrative functions.

ADMINISTRATORS' IMPORTANCE RANKINGS

Administrators were also asked to rank the five most important areas of the twenty-one listed for a successful 1979-80 school year.

Table VII shows the percentage of time an area was ranked as one of the five most important.

TABLE VII

ADMINISTRATORS' PERCENTAGE OF TIME AN AREA WAS RANKED AS ONE OF THE FIVE MOST IMPORTANT

District Areas	Percentage
School Environment	61
Staff Assignments	55
Quality Educational Programs	50
Resource (funds, materials, staff) Allocation	35
Clear Expectations for Staff	34
Staff Development/Training	27
Instruction and Curriculum Development	25
Clear Expectations for Students	22
Central Administrative Support	19
Planning and Implementation Processes	19
Community Involvement/Parents Interests and Participation	18
Communication Channels	17
Program Continuity	16
Transportation Services	15
Well-defined Central Administrative Roles and Responsibilities	14
Decision-making Process	14
Staff Support for District Programs and Activities	14
Coordination of Activities	12
Long Range Planning	10
Availability of Information for the Public	05
Availability of Information for District Personnel	02

Respondents: Principals-64; Central Administrators-49

"School Environment" was ranked as the most important by nearly two-thirds of the administrators (61%), followed in order by "Staff Assignments" (55%), "Quality Educational Programs" (50%), "Resource (funds, materials, staff) Allocation" (35%) and "Clear Expectations for Staff" (34%). "Availability of Information for District Personnel" (27%) was ranked as the least most important, preceeded in order by "Availability of Information for the Public" (5%), and "Long Range Planning" (10%). It might be noted that all of these areas ranked as the least important are Central Administrative functions.

Importance rankings by type of administrators Table VIII shows the five areas ranked as the most important by type of administrators.

TABLE VIII

IMPORTANCE RANKINGS BY TYPE OF ADMINISTRATORS

District Areas	Principal Percentage	Central Administrators Percentage
School Environment	70	49
Staff Assignments.	66	41
Quality Educational Programs	52	47
Resource (funds, materials, staff) Allocation	36	35
Clear Expectations for Staff	33	35

Principals and Central Administrators ranked the same five areas as most important. Although Principals and Central Administrators ranked these areas in slightly different order, the differences in the relative rankings of these areas are not nearly as significant as the almost uniform endorsement of the five areas ranked most important.

Principals ranked "School Environment" highest, "Staff Assignments" second highest and "Quality Educational Programs" third highest. Central Administrators ranked "Quality Educational Programs" first, "School Environment" second, and "Staff Assignments" third.

The fourth and fifth ranked areas were "Resource (funds, materials, staff) Allocation" and "Clear Expectations for Staff" for Principals. These two areas were tied for fourth for Central Administrators.

IMPORTANCE RANKINGS AND DEGREE OF SUCCESS COMPARISON

Two of the five areas ranked most important by Central Administrators and principals, "School Environment" and "Quality Educational Programs" were also rated in the five most successful areas. "Staff Assignments" which received

the lowest average success grade was ranked second in importance ranking. Two other areas, which were ranked among the five most important, "Staff Development/Training", and "Resource (funds, materials, staff) Allocation", were rated eight, and fifteenth overall in the degree of success.

COMPARISON OF CENTRAL ADMINISTRATORS, PRINCIPALS, AND TEACHERS AVERAGE GRADE RATINGS

The average overall grade for principals were 2.39, central administrators were 2.01 and teachers 1.85. Principals as a group rated all of the areas higher than teachers in all areas except "Availability of Information for the Public" and "Community Involvement/Parents Interest and Participation" higher than central administrators. Central administrators rated both areas higher than principals and teachers (See Table XI page 15). Principals rated each area an average of .55 higher than teachers and an average of .37 higher than central administrators. Central administrators rated each area an average of .18 higher than teachers.

There was a difference of .50 or greater between principals and central administrators in eight areas. They were:

TABLE IX

AVERAGE GRADE RATINGS DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRINCIPALS AND CENTRAL ADMINISTRATORS

District Areas	Principals Average Grade	Central Administrators Average Grade
Instruction and Curriculum Development	2.27	1.71
Coordination of Activities	2.17	1.90
Program Continuity	2.27	1.63
Staff Assignments	2.03	1.37
Quality Educational Programs	2.81	2.10
School Environment	3.05	2.16
Clear Expectations for Staff	2.66	1.76
Clear Expectations for Students	2.64	1.69

In each of the remaining thirteen areas there was a difference of .34 or less. Between Principals and teachers there were nine areas with a difference of .50 or greater. They were:

TABLE X

AVERAGE GRADE RATINGS DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

District Areas	Principals Average Grade	Teachers Average Grade
School Environment	3.05	2.29
Quality Educational Programs	2.81	2.31
Program Continuity	2.27	1.73
Availability of Information for District Personnel	2.39	1.83
Communication Channels	2.33	1.60
Planning and Implementation Processes	2.34	1.67

TABLE XI

COMPARISON OF CENTRAL ADMINISTRATORS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS AVERAGE GRADE RATINGS

District Areas	Teachers	Principals	Central Administrators
School Environment	2.29	3.05	2.16
Staff Development Courses/Training*	2.15	2.39	2.18
Staff Assignments	1.65	2.03	1.37
Instruction and Curriculum Development	1.98	2.27	1.71
Clear Expectations for Staff	1.98	2.66	1.76
Clear Expectations for Students	2.06	2.64	1.69
Coordination of Activities	2.01	2.47	1.90
Quality Educational Programs	2.31	2.81	2.10
Program Continuity	1.73	2.27	1.63
Communication Channels	1.60	2.33	2.20
Availability of Information for District Personnel	1.83	2.39	2.22
Availability of Information for the Public	1.87	2.41	2.47
Community Involvement/Parents Interest and Participation	1.81	2.22	2.39
Decision-making Process	1.52	1.92	1.88
Planning and Implementation Processes	1.67	2.34	2.27
Long Range Planning	1.47	1.95	1.61
Central Administrative Roles and Responsibilities	1.43	1.97	1.80
Central Administrative Support	1.27	2.63	2.31
Staff Support for District Program and Activities	2.01	2.36	2.10
Resource (funds, materials, staff) Allocation	1.56	2.17	1.98
Transportation Services	2.34	2.83	2.53

*Includes Central and Building Staff Development courses for teachers

TABLE XII

AVERAGE GRADE RATINGS DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

District Areas	Principals Average Grade	Teachers Average Grade
Clear Expectations for Staff	2.66	1.98
Clear Expectations for Student	2.64	2.06
Central Administrative Support	2.63	1.27
Well-defined Central Administrative Roles and Responsibilities.	1.97	1.43
Availability of Information for Public . .	2.41	1.87

In each of the remaining areas there was a difference of .49 or less. Five of the areas that had a difference of .50 or greater between Principals and Central Administrators also had a difference of .50 or greater between prinicpals and teachers rating.

There were only four areas with a difference of .50 or greater between Teachers and Central Administrators. They were:

TABLE XIII

AVERAGE GRADE RATINGS DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TEACHERS AND CENTRAL ADMINISTRATORS

District Areas	Teachers Average Grade	Central Administrators Average Grade
Communication Channels	1.60	2.20
Availability of Information for the Public.	1.87	2.47
Community Involvement/Parents Interest and Participation	1.81	2.39
Planning and Implementation Processes. . .	1.67	2.27

In each of the remaining areas there was a difference of .42 or less.

The biggest difference between the average grade rating occurs between principals and teachers. Principals rated "Central Administrative Support" 2.63 and teachers rated it 1.27, a difference of 1.36. The smallest difference between the average grade rating occur between principals and central administrators in the area of decision-making process. Principals average grade was 1.92 ad central administrators 1.88, a difference of .04.

CONCLUSIONS

Using the grading scale of 4.00 = excellent, 3.00 = good, 2.00 = acceptable, 1.00 = poor, and 0.00 failing, responses to the teachers survey indicate that teachers rated the District performance in the areas surveyed as marginally acceptable (grade average 1.85). Five areas associated with central administration received a poor overall average grade:

Resources (funds, materials, staff) Allocation	1.56
Decision-making Process.	1.52
Long Range Planning.	1.47
Well-defined Central Administrative Roles and Responsibilities.	1.43
Central Administrative Support	1.27

No areas received an overall average grade of excellent "A" or good "B" from the District teachers. Elementary teachers were more satisfied than high school and Jr/Middle school teachers. Elementary minority teachers were more satisfied than any other group of teachers. Jr/Middle school minority male teachers were the most dissatisfied teachers in the District followed closely by high school minority male teachers. Sixty-three (63) percent of the District teachers rated the District overall between poor and failing, twenty (20) percent rated the District acceptable and seventeen (17) percent rated the District between good and excellent.

Responses to the administrators survey indicate that central administrators and principals rated the district performance in the areas surveyed with an overall acceptable grade average of 2.22. Forty-one (41) percent of the district administrators rated the District between good and excellent, thirty-nine (39) percent rated the District acceptable and twenty (20) percent rated the District between poor and failing.

Principals and central administrators rated the District higher overall than teachers. Administrators and teachers ranked "School Environment", "Staff Assignments" and "Quality Educational Programs" as the three most important areas for a successful 1979-80 school year and in the same order. They also agreed that "Clear Expectations for Staff" was the fifth most important area. They disagreed on the fourth area. Teachers ranked "Clear Expectations for Students" and administrators ranked "Resource (funds, materials, staff) Allocation" as the fourth most important area.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff Development: Due to the perceived importance of Human Relations Training teachers indicated it as less helpful than other staff development activities, it is recommended that an evaluation of the process and outcome of the Human Relations Training Program be conducted with particular forms or differential effects for different ethnic and sex groups.

Morale:

A number of areas rated by teachers and administrators indicate a sense of frustration with and alienation from the District's administrative and decision-making functions. A similiar sense of frustration and lack of support was evident in rating of areas related to District's support.

It is recommended that a task force of administrators and teachers be convened to discuss the issues that are causing teachers and administrators to be frustrated with and alienated from the Districts' administrative and decision-making functions.

APPENDIX A

TEACHERS' SURVEY

EVALUATION AND TESTING OFFICE

TEACHER SURVEY

1. Sex: (1) ____ Male
(2) ____ Female

2. Ethnic Group: (1) ____ Majority (White)
(2) ____ Minority (other ethnic group)

3. Position: (1) ____ Teacher
(2) ____ Counselor
(3) ____ Teacher Aide
(4) ____ Human Relations Associate
(5) ____ Other: _____

4. School Code: (1) ____ Elementary
(2) ____ Junior High/Middle
(3) ____ Senior High

5. Do you work in: (Please check whichever categories describe your school)
(1) ____ "Racially Imbalanced" School (over 58% minority)
(2) ____ Educational Program Option (Horizon, Multi-arts, etc.)
(3) ____ Alternative Program (NOVA, GAOP, etc.)
(4) ____ Pair
(5) ____ Triad

6. If you have taken the formal Human Relations Training course offered by the District, please indicate how helpful it has been to you in your work:

(1) ____ The Year and
(2) ____ Very Helpful
(3) ____ Helpful
(4) ____ Not Helpful
(5) ____ Have not taken the course

7. If you participated in any of the following staff development activities during the past year, please indicate how helpful it has been to you in your work:

	Summer Inservice Training	Building Orientation	Central District Staff Development Courses/Workshops	In-Building Staff Development Courses/Workshops	
(1)	_____	_____	_____	_____	Very Helpful
(2)	_____	_____	_____	_____	Helpful
(3)	_____	_____	_____	_____	Not Helpful

8. Please rank the following staff development activities from 1 to 5 in order of their importance for successful implementation of 1979-80 desegregation programs. (Assign a "1" to the most important, a "2" to the second most important and so on to the fifth most important.)

____ Human Relations Training
____ Ethnic Cultural Heritage Program (Rainbow)
____ Curriculum Training
____ Multiethnic/Multicultural Awareness and Skills Training
____ Building Orientation for Pairs and Triads
____ Other_____

(Continued on reverse side)

Approved by: Hal Reasby
Associate Superintendent

9. Listed below are a number of major needs identified by administrators and teachers in the 1977-78 ADMINISTRATOR/TEACHER surveys as important for a successful 1978-79 school year under the Seattle Plan. Please rate the degree of success in the following areas by using the grading scale below ("order of importance" boxes are for use in the next question.)

A = Excellent B = Good C = Acceptable D = Poor F = Failing

			Order of Importance
____	1	School Environment	____
____	2	Central District Staff Development Courses/Workshops	____
____	3	In-Building Staff Development Courses/Workshops	____
____	4	Staff Assignments	____
____	5	Instruction and Curriculum Development	____
____	6	Clear Expectations for Staff	____
____	7	Clear Expectations for Students	____
____	8	Coordination of Activities	____
____	9	Quality Educational Programs	____
____	10	Program Continuity	____
____	11	Communication Channels	____
____	12	Availability of Information for District Personnel	____
____	13	Availability of Information for the Public	____
____	14	Community Involvement/Parents Interest and Participation	____
____	15	Decision-making Process	____
____	16	Planning and Implementation Processes	____
____	17	Long Range Planning	____
____	18	Well-defined Central Administrative Roles and Responsibilities	____
____	19	Central Administrative Support	____
____	20	Staff Support for District Programs and Activities	____
____	21	Resource (funds, materials, staff) Allocation	____
____	22	Transportation Services	____

10. Next please rank five areas above in order of their importance for a successful 1979-80 school year under the Seattle Plan. (Mark "1" for most important, "2" for second most important and so on to the fifth most important in the box labeled "order of importance.")

11. If you have been involved in desegregation programs, which activities and techniques have you used or learned which may be effective for developing a positive integrated school climate?

PLEASE RETURN TO THE EVALUATION OFFICE, A&S JUNE 8

5/79

APPENDIX B

ADMINISTRATORS' SURVEY

EVALUATION AND TESTING OFFICE

ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY

1. Sex: _____ Male
   _____ Female

2. Ethnic Group: _____ Majority (White)
   _____ Minority (other ethnic group)

3. Position: _____ Principal
   _____ A & S Instructional Line Administrator
   _____ A & S Instructional Support Administrator
   _____ A & S Management Services Administrator
   _____ A & S Office of Planning and Budget

4. Primary 1978-79 desegregation responsibilities: (Please check the one area below which most closely defines the major portion of your responsibilities toward desegregation this school year.)
   _____ Desegregation Planning
   _____ Educational Program Option Transfer Implementation (formerly Magnet program)
   _____ Schools, Programs or Services Minimally Involved in Desegregation
   _____ Significant Responsibilities to All Aspects of Desegregation (all of the above)

5. If you have taken the formal Human Relations Training Course offered by the District, please indicate the year and how helpful it has been to you in your work:
   _____ The Year
   _____ Very Helpful
   _____ Helpful
   _____ Not Helpful
   _____ Have Not Taken the Course

6. Listed below are a number of major needs identified by administrators and teachers in the 1977-78 ADMINISTRATOR/TEACHER surveys as important for a successful 1978-79 school year under the Seattle Plan. Please rate the degree of success in the following areas by using the grading scale below ("order of importance" boxes are for use in the next question.)

A = Excellent B = Good C = Acceptable D = Poor F = Failing

			Order of Importance
_____	1.	School Environment	_____
_____	2.	Staff Development/Training	_____
_____	3.	Staff Assignments	_____
_____	4.	Instruction and Curriculum Development	_____
_____	5.	Clear Expectations for Staff	_____
_____	6.	Clear Expectations for Students	_____
_____	7.	Coordination of Activities	_____
_____	8.	Quality Educational Programs	_____
_____	9.	Program Continuity	_____
_____	10.	Communication Channels	_____
_____	11.	Availability of Information for District Personnel	_____
_____	12.	Availability of Information for the Public	_____
_____	13.	Community Involvement/Parents Interest and Participation	_____
_____	14.	Decision-making Process	_____
_____	15.	Planning and Implementation Processes	_____
_____	16.	Long Range Planning	_____
_____	17.	Well-defined Central Administrative Roles and Responsibilities	_____
_____	18.	Central Administrative Support	_____
_____	19.	Staff Support for District Programs and Activities	_____
_____	20.	Resource (funds, materials, staff) Allocation	_____
_____	21.	Transportation Services	_____

7. Next please rank five areas above in order of their importance for a successful 1979-80 school year under the Seattle Plan. (Mark "1" for most important, "2" for second most important and so on to the fifth most important in the box labeled "order of importance.")

(Continued on reverse side)

Approved by: Hal Reasby HR
Associate Superintendent

ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY

8. If you have been involved in desegregation programs, which activities and techniques have you used or learned which may be effuctive for developing a positive integrated school climate?

9. Please identify the three major problems you encountered this year which need resolution for successful desegregation implementation in 1979-80.

5/79

Please return to Evaluation Office, A & S by May 29